

**REMARKS**

The Office Action requires election of a species from the following: Group I, drawn to the subject matter of Figs. 1-9, including claims 7-17 and 21-23; and Group II, drawn to the subject matter of Figs. 10-11, including claims 7-23.

The Office Action indicates that claims 7-17 and 21-23 are generic. Allowance of a generic claim requires consideration of claims which depend therefrom or which otherwise contain all the limitations of the generic claim.

Applicants elect Group I, drawn to the subject matter of Figs. 1-9, including claims 7-17 and 21-23.

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement. Claims 18-20 are all dependent claims and therefore unity of invention is present between the generic claims 7-17 and 21-23 on the one hand and the dependent claims 18-20 on the other. MPEP § 1850 (II) makes clear that the dependency of a claim is sufficient to establish unity of invention.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due. If there is any fee due the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jordan and Hamburg LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg  
C. Bruce Hamburg  
Reg.No. 22,389  
Attorney for Applicants

B and,

By Ricardo Unikel  
Ricardo Unikel  
Reg. No. 52,309  
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340